

CONFORMITY RE-ASSERTED

In an Echo to R. S.

OR,

A Return of his VVord to

Doctor Womock's

ASSERTING,

1. That Modification of Publick Worship by personal Abilities is not the formal Act of the Ministerial Office.
2. That the Ministers of the Church of England ought to submit to the use of an Imposed Liturgy.

AND

Dissolving the Objections of Mr. CROFTON
and R. S. to the Contrary.

By ^{queneesock} L. W. D. D. A. S.

Jerubbaal Justified, Page 35.

*The Worship of God doth Truly, Formally, and Salvably exist
in and by the English Liturgy.*

L O N D O N :

Printed by F. G. for Thomas Clark at the South entrance
of the Royal Exchange, 1664.

*Tricks
Womock*

Doctor Womock

IMPRIMATUR:

*Job: Hall R.P.D. Hmfr: Episc. Lond. &
Sac. Domest. Mar. 9. 1663.*

THE PREFACE.



When the Doctors Sheets, relating to Mr. Calamy's Sermon, were Printed off, there fell into his hands by chance a Book that bore this Title, Jerubbaal Justified. The pretended Design of this Book, though it cast a sufficient deal of dirt upon the Establish'd Service of the Church, was to induce the people to frequent it, by proving it to be their Duty to Communicate therein, otherwise, the Author affirm'd, they were guilty of the breach of the Fourth Commandment. The Doctor liked the Authors plea for Communion well enough. But besides the by-blows which he gave, in his Discourse, as well to the Establish'd Laws as to those in Authority, and the Liturgy in itself, the Doctor found he had put forth this Scandalous Position of Mr. Croftons (with his Commendations and a challenge) viz. That no Minister of the Gospel can receive an imposed Liturgy without Sin; (or to this effect.) The Doctor acquainted a worthy person with it, who having read the Position over, with Mr. Croftons endeavours to prove the same, he told the Doctor something must needs be returned in Answer to it, and prevailed with him to add those few pages at the end of the Sheets above mentioned, upon this account.

As the Doctor was unsatisfied with Mr. Croftons Position, [That no Minister of the Gospel could without sin receive an imposed Liturgy] So it seems some Separatist was unsatisfied with Jerubbaal Justified, for affirming that the people could not without sin refuse to Communicate therein. And this Person having written in Defence of Separation, against Mr. Crofton's Advocate, as the Doctor had done in Justification of the use of an establish'd Liturgy against Mr. Crofton himself; This provokes R. S. (for those are the

Letters he desires to be known by) to take up the Cudgels against them both, and puts forth a Pamphlet with this Title, A Word to Doctor Womock, and A Blow (to the Brother of the Separation.) How the Separatist can bear his smart Blow I am not much concerned to examine, but of his Word to Doctor Womock here is a full and strict account as to all the Syllables and Accents of it. That it comes forth no sooner, the reason is, because the Doctor never had the least hint of such an Adversary till many moneths after his Pamphlet was dispersed; nor then neither, but casually by the hand of an old acquaintance, to whom some of that Party had privately presented a Copy, with some insultation at the performance. For what these men are not allow'd to do above board upon the common Stall, or in the Pulpit, they vent under-hand and at private Meetings, by those many Non-Conformists, who still have and still take all advantages to foment such seeds of Sedition and Schism as they have formerly sown in the several places where they had been unduly planted. I shall give the Reader no more trouble, after I have desired him to Correct some few Escapes of the Printer, and pass by such as are less Material.

ERRATA.

PAGE 1. line 14. r. a leading man, p. 3. l. 19. r. give him time, p. 17. l. 3. for action r. notion, p. 24. l. 18. r. that will, p. 33. l. 24. dele as.



*An Echo to R. S. or a Return of his
Word to Dr. Womock.*



Lthough *R. S.* be the two first letters of *Rebellion* and *Schism*, we shall not determine they signifie so much in this place ; but leave it to the Mistress of the *ABC* to interpret them. If they stand for the right Name of our *Antagonist*, possibly *R* is the first letter of the last syllable of his *Christian-name*, and then he has held some *mastership* by *Sequestration*, and upon that account has arriv'd at such *dexterity* (as you see) in the art of *Disputation*. He is so well vers'd in the terms of the *Militia*, we may very well conclude him to be a *leading-man* in the black regiment of *Bonteseus*, who made up the *Evangelium Armatum*. However, we find him a very *waspish* Adversary ; he is but *A Word* and a *Blow*, (for so he tells the world in the very *Frontispice* of his *Pamphlet*) though, while he deals his *Blow* to an *Opponent* that sufficiently deserves it, he is so gentle, he gives the Doctor but *A Word* ; and truly that *Word*, though *loud*, so empty, that if it were not *unsavoury*, it could as little offend as hurt the Doctor.

B

By

2
Conformity re-asserted.

By his insolent carriage you may conclude him to be near-allied to the *Pharisees*; for he doth no less admire himself than despise others; not onely a *Prelatical* Clergy, (which is not to be wondered at) but his own brethren of the *Separation* and the *Covenant*; and this he doth even then when he is pleading for *Non-conformity* to the *Service* and *Orders* of the Church.

And herein he pretends to *humility* and *modesty*, and speaks demurely of *Conscience* and the *Fear of God*; while he discovers abundance of *pride* and *arrogance*, which (as it hath nothing but a little thin *Sophistry* to support it, so it) betrays him to *prejudice* and *passion*, *rancour* and *contumely*, against both his *Superiours* and *Informers*. But I shall not suffer my pen to rake into the filthy ulcers of this feeble *Lazar*, but content my self with pointing at them as we pass along, that you may take notice of the Infection to avoid it.

This proud *Philistim* doth strut and advance himself with his crest erect, as if he design'd to despise all the armies of the living God; and thus he begins to crow and bespeak his victory.

“Since my publication of *Fernubbaal* justified, there hath appeared against it, and me, and Mr. Crofton concerned in it, a double Assault, by two different *Antagonists*, as directly contrary each to the other as the right and left Wing, onely combin'd in one *battalia* under the Prince of darkness [*Behold his charity*] to darken and, if possible, destroy the truth; so that as Luther between Pope and Anabaptist, stands Mr. Crofton between a *Prelatical* Clergy and *Separatists*: yet *vincet veritas*. [*This is a prediction of his own overthrow*; yet he gallops on in triumph, making his *bravadoes* in this language.] “Such is the unspeakable weakness of both these mens batteries, that I have passed them with scorn, [*This is his humility*]
and

“and stood still in expectation of the on-set of their main
 “Battalia [*Behold his non-sense; for whom doth he under-*
 “*stand when he saith this?*] on the one side or on the
 “other; but none appearing, I thought good to check
 “their Insultation [*sed alio fastu*] (with which I hear
 “*[with your harvest-ears]* they are puffed up) by these
 “few lines. And first, to begin with the learned Doctor,
 “I would crave leave to tell him, if he will give good
 “assurance that he will in the Schools of the University
 “give Mr. Crofton (*viva voce*) the Answer published in
 “his name, I will be bound [*What, by your Solemn League*
 “*and Covenant?*] Mr. Crofton shall meet him to receive
 “it, and [*Enter Impertinence and Vanity*] if the Boys do
 “not hiss the Doctor, he shall go out *victor*. By which
 discourse a man might wager that he held his *wis* as well
 as his *mastership* by Sequestration, and the *side* being now
 turn'd, he is quite *outed* of them both. But let us give
 him time. *Inc.*

“Shall I presume (saith he) to take a turn with this
 “reverend Archdeacon? I must then tell him, if he did
 “not mistake, his Printer hath wrong'd him at the entrance
 “of his Undertaking, to make him read *Non-conformist*
 “instead of *Now-conformist*.

A very remarkable Observation! but the Doctor was
 aware of the distinction, and so the mistake is imputable
 to the *Compositor* or the *Corrector* of the Press. But this
 advantage will not get *R. S.* the victory, for it is nothing
 to the purpose; and therefore he wheels about, and charges
 again in these lines.

“That *pride and overweening conceit of our own worth*
 “*maketh men Non-conformists*, I deny; for it is *humility* and
 “*the fear of the Lord*; They dare not deviate from Di-
 “vine directions, and your instance is an evidence of the
 “same; whilest Mr. Crofton doth humbly consult whe-

“ther his *Conformity* may consist with his *Ministerial Office*, and modestly offer his Notions to *Argumentation*;
 “the one sheweth his *fear of sin*, whilst the other sheweth his *willingness to be convinced*, and both his *humility*..

Here, Mr. *Replicant*, you talk of the *fear of the Lord* and the *fear of sin*; and if you could name but one single person of your persuasion (and, if you consult your own bosom, you dare not be so arrogant as to make your self the Instance) that was not heartily engaged in the late *rebellion*, you might have some colour to be believed: But some of you will pretend, that God puts his fear into your hearts by an *omnipotent* operation, and then that fear acts you *irresistibly*, and consequently whether you run into *Schism* or *Sedition*, or any other crime, you do all in the *fear of God*, and you cannot do otherwise. But if you fear *sin*, 'tis at the same rate with those *blind guides*, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Do you fear *sin*, who are not afraid to speak evil of dignities? You may pretend to be afraid of a *Liturgy* imposed by your Kings command, but you are not afraid of a *Covenant* imposed against his Authority. You are afraid to have your shoulders in a *Surplice*, but you are not afraid to have your hands in *bloud*. And yet you make the world believe, such is your *fear of the Lord*, you dare not deviate from *Divine directions*: But is not this one of the *Divine directions*, Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give an account. And this, We command you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw your selves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he hath received of us. Do not you deviate from these directions? Impudence itself cannot deny it without blushing. Whom Mr. *Crosion* consulted in this case I know not: but when men do im-

pannel

panel their fellows upon the jury to inquire into their misdemeanours, they expect a more favourable *verdict* than to be found guilty. That notions may be offered to argumentation rather out of pride than any desire to receive satisfaction, you are not to learn; and we cannot discover over-much modesty in the papers that either he or you have offered to the world: but if there be that *humility* and *willingness* to be convinced which you pretend to, a little time will shew it. But it begets a *vehement* suspicion you are not *ingenuous*, when you use such *Sophistry* to blind the true state of the *question*, and impose upon your unwary Reader, as we shall observe (with your *contradictions*) in your discourse following.

“ His position (saith R. S.) you have truly transcribed, “ and observed the state thereof, [*so you confess*] but [*you say*] if to affirm, *It cannot be denied to be a most base and slavish servility to prostitute the Office to which we are apted and ordained by the Lord Jesus Christ unto the pleasure and prescriptions of men, though the best for Quality and Authority*, be to be proud, I will be proud, [*You say, and I believe you whether so or otherwise*] and glory in my pride: And I doubt not, if you were calendered as a man who should deny this Position, you, Sir, would be found proud enough to declare your displeasure, as unjustly reproched. [*How much of truth is in this your presumption we shall see anon; but you adde*] I therefore soberly require you to deny it if you can or dare; [*you are a bold champion*] and if you cannot, what meaneth this digressive flourish? [*I desire the Reader by the way to take notice how this Replicant contradicts himself for want of a good memory; for what he calls here a digressive flourish, after a few lines (to serve his own turn) he makes to be the very question in debate: but he goes on thus,*] “ Your flourish indeed hath given you the start, so that you have *lost* your question, and

* Palpit-
Concep-
tions Popu-
lar Decep-
tions, per
10111170.

"and fall on a magisterial swada [with a w] of Mr. Croftons Conformity: Which of Mr. Croftons Syllogisms do you hereby shake? Is not this fair disputing? To this I answer, That the *only* Argument which the Doctor had not formerly shaken all to pieces in other of his Papers *, he undertook to dispute in these; and sure as this is a way to avoid needless repetitions, so 'tis a course of fair disputing.

But R.S. proceeds and tells the Doctor, "*We will weigh your Reason: You say, Mr. Crofton may please to be so humble as to condescend to such an Imposition for peace and orders sake. And then he falls into a convulsion and ecstasy, and cries out, [How! condescend to such an Imposition which prostituteth the Office received from Christ to the pleasure of men? Can you desire it? were you in earnest when you wrote this? can you judge it an act of humility, or not rather the greatest arrogance, for Mr. Crofton instead of Minister of Jesus Christ to write a Minister of Men?] Thus he raves he knows not why, and if he be not out of his wits, I am sure he is out of his Logick. A fallacy, Ignoratio Elenchi, hath brought him into this paroxysm and distemper; for the position (against which the Doctor combats) is this, (and this Replicants doth in cool blood acknowledge that the Doctor hath truly transcribed it, and observed the state thereof) That stated Forms for the celebration of solemn publick worship, and the several parts thereof, composed, digested, and (for the very words, terms, and expressions thereof) determined and prescribed by some others than the Parson or Minister, who standeth to minister Gods Ordinances between God and his Church; such an imposed Liturgy Mr. Crofton cannot without sin submit unto. This is clearly Mr. Croftons Position, and when he grows warm in pursuing the proof of it, he lets his passions loose into declamation, and saith, [It cannot be denied to be a most base*

Position,
pag 2.

base and slavish servility, to prostitute the Office to which we are adapted and ordained by the Lord Jesus Christ, unto the pleasure and prescriptions of men, though the best for Quality and Authority.] From which insolent Assertion the Doctor did argue, that Pride had a strong hand in the management of this contention; and endeavouring to becalm Mr. Croftons passions, he attempted to prove him obliged to condescend to such an Imposition (of *Liturgie*, as was formerly mentioned, and is the true state of the Controversie) for peace and orders sake; and the Doctors Argument was this:

What I may lawfully be determined to by my own private judgment, that I may lawfully be determined to by the judgment of my Superiours: But to stated forms for the celebration of Gods solemn publick worship, composed, (and for the very words, terms and expressions) digested into method, I may lawfully be determined by my own private judgment: Therefore to stated forms for the celebration of Gods solemn publick worship, composed and (for the very words, terms and expressions) digested into method, I may lawfully be determined by the judgment of my Superiours.

Here the *Replicant* having lost sight of the Question himself, or rather wilfully mistaken it, runs out into expostulation with the Doctor after this manner; "But how now Mr. Doctor? what is become of your Question? do you not use to bring that into your Conclusion? that Mr. Crofton ought to condescend to *such an Imposition* which *prostituteth the Office received from Christ to the pleasure of men*, was that you pretended to prove; doth not your Syllogism want a foot more to make it reach? But to play with the *prevaricator*, know (Sir) I deny both the Propositions of your well-form'd Syllogism.

But now, Mr. *Replicant*, give me leave to take a turn with you in your vein of Expostulation. Do not you play
the

the *Impostor*, thus to *disguise* your self, and *palliate* your *disobedience* to the well-settled *Orders* of the Church, by calling that which is your *duty* by an ugly name, *A prostitution of your Office received from Christ to the pleasures of men*? And do not you know that the Doctor alleged the said passage from Mr. Crofton not as *the state of the question*, (which you confess he had *truly observed*) but as a proof of the *pride* of those that contend about it; for which reason you call it a *digressive flourish*. If the question had been this, *Whether that expression had been a sufficient argument of their pride*? I confess the Doctors Syllogism had not been concluding, because defective; but the question being about *stated Forms*, and *that* truly transcribed and observed by the Doctor, as you acknowledge, you play the *prevaricator* your self, (which is something more than playing with him) and the *Impostor* too, thus to use *fallacies* to delude your Reader. But having done this, you exercise a little ingenuity towards the Doctor in telling him his Syllogism is a *well-form'd Syllogism*, though you manfully deny both the Propositions of it.

1. You deny the *minor Proposition*, viz. That *to stated Forms for celebration of Gods solemn publick worship, composed and (for the very words, terms and expressions) digested into method, I may lawfully be determined by mine own private judgment.*] This he denies. But how now, Mr. Replicant? May I not be determined by *my own private judgment*? How doth this cotten with your Answer to the major, (a little after) where you discourse thus? [*Mine own eye is the best guide of mine own steps; mine own understanding is my candle from the Lord; my dim light, judicium rationale, shineth brighter in the closet of mine own breast than 400. candles, or the forensie judicium of a Convocation;* (and a little after) *I will move by mine own eye, be it never so weak, and my Superiours never so strong; though my dim light*
secth

seeth not more, it seeth more truly and more directly than
their brighter.] Thus the *Replicant* preacheth in commen-
 dation of his own private judgment, when he is returning an
 Answer to the *major*; but now, that he is concerned to say
 otherwise, (*right or wrong*) he finds this his candle from
 the Lord to be such an *Ignis fatuus*, that he saith, in this case
 he cannot lawfully be determined by it.

Were this *Replicant* true to his own Principles, we need
 go no further for a proof of this Proposition than his own
 Affirmations; but because he plays fast and loose with his
 Answers, we shall evince the truth of our Proposition by
 this Argument; *To stated Forms for celebration of Gods so-*
lemn worship I must be determined, either immediately by the
Authority of God himself, or by the Prescription of my Superi-
ours, or by the resolution of my Equals and Inferiours, or by
my own private judgment. I cannot expect the first; no
 man, that is well in his wits, will now pretend to divine re-
 velation to determine his particular forms of prayer; and
 the *Replicant* will not allow of the second, the prescriptions
 of our *Superiours* to this effect; and that we should be de-
 termined by the *Resolutions* of our *Equals* or *Inferiours*, I
 am sure is much more unreasonable than the former: It
 follows therefore, That (unless we stand to the courtesie
 of some Familiar Spirit to suggest the Form to us) we
 must be determined herein by our own private judgment,
 or else remain for ever undetermined.

But the truth is, though *R. S.* finds himself concerned
 to keep a close Guard, and for that reason denies the Pro-
 position; yet he does it upon such a ground as doth clear-
 ly yield it; for, he saith, Though *Mr. Crofton* doth not
 exclude his own judgment when he pleads for the liberty of his
 own invention to compose and modify his own forms of pub-
 lick worship, yet he denieth his judgment a power to deter-
 mine a *stated Form*, *semper eadem*, *always the same*, for

C

words,

Conformity re-asserted.

words, terms and expressions, whatever be the variations of Gods providence and the Churches condition.] Here, I say, he doth grant the Proposition which he offers to deny: For 1. in this case, doth not the *private judgment* still determine the *form* according to the *variation* of providences and conditions? What is it else that doth determine him, for *words, terms and expressions*, upon those *various occasions*? And 2. the Doctors argument is not restrained to *one single form*, *semper eadem*, *always the same*, whatever be the *variations* of Gods providence and the Churches condition: The Doctor argues for *Forms* in the plural number, and our *Superiours* have furnished us with *variety*, (and can adde more) according to the *variation* of providences. Besides the *ordinary Service*, with *occasional Collects*, is there not an *Office* for the 5. of November, and another for the 29. of May, yea and one for the 30. of January too? we may thank such as you for the occasion, while we praise God for the *blessings* commemorated in them.

But let us attend the march of this great Champion: [Nor doth this any way follow (saith he) on the use of his judgment in managing his liberty. That a man may judge a Crutch fit for his own condition, will not conclude that he may *sanâ mente* confine himself to a Crutch, one and the same Crutch, at all times in all conditions: This argumentation is a manifest halting before a Creeple. In the last, the judgment must needs be erroneous, to be corrected before it be obeyed.] To as much of this discourse as is intelligible I answer, That if the Cripple acteth *sanâ mente*, it is his own judgment that determines him, *what crutch* is fit for his condition, and *at what time*, and *upon what occasion* he should use it, and that is enough to verifie the truth of our Proposition against his groundless denial of it. If he lay aside his Crutch before he can walk steadfastly with-

out.

but it, or change it for a worse, then he doth not act *sana mente*, he is not determined by his judgment, but follows the wild roivings of a giddy fancy like a *frantick* person.

But I find our *Replicants* begins to *halt*, and is like to come *lamely* off in his answer to this Proposition; and therefore for pity-sake I will not take his *crutch* from him, though it stands him in no stead, but to help a very *little* wit to bring in an old proverb to as little purpose; nor will I meddle with his *non-sense* in these words, [*In the last, the judgment must needs be erroneous, to be corrected before it be obeyed*] but pass on presently to the proof of the major, viz. *What I may lawfully be determined to by my own private judgment, that I may lawfully be determined to by the judgment of my Superiours.* This our *Replicant* doth deny; and it is thus enforced;

What I may lawfully be determined to by a weaker judgment, to that I may lawfully be determined by a judgment that is stronger. But to stated Forms &c. I may lawfully be determined by a weaker judgment, viz. mine own. Ergo to stated Forms, &c. I may lawfully be determined by a judgment that is stronger, viz. my Superiours.

What saith the *Replicant* to this Argument? [*Here, Sir, (saith he) to make the Auditors laugh, I will again become ridiculous in your fancy, and deny both your Propositions.*]

Here the man deals very honestly, and is as good as his word; for doth not he become *ridiculous* that talks of a *sequel* in a plain *categorical* Proposition? And is not he worthy to be *laugh'd at*, who in the repetition of a *Syllogism* makes four Terms where he finds but three? and so does he; for he saith, [*I deny the major in the sequel, I may be determined by the weaker judgment; and it will not thence follow, that I must therefore be determined by the stronger judgment.*] Here the *Replicant* turns [*may*] in-

to [must], which makes a considerable difference in the Proposition: but let him make his best advantage of it; and thus I answer, If I may be determined by the *lesser* light or judgment rather than the stronger, then either because it is *less*, or because it is *mine own*. Not the *first*, because it is *less*; for if so, then the *Fews* had better means to determine them than the *Christians*, and the *Gentiles* than the *Fews*, and we should be concern'd to grow, not in *knowledge*, but in *ignorance*. This our *Replicant* dares not affirm. The reason then why I may be determined by the *lesser* light or weaker judgment is, because it is *my own*; and [*mine own eye is the best guide of my own steps, though I see but darkly, (saith our Antagonist :) my own understanding is my candle from the Lord; my dim light, judicium rationale, shineth brighter in the closet of mine own breast, than 400. candles, or the forensē judicium of a Convocation.*] Thus our *Replicant* in one breath, 1. mistakes the question, and 2. imposeth upon the Reader, and 3. interferes with Gods holy word and ordinance. First, he mistakes the question here, which is, whether a man may be determined by his own weaker light rather than the greater light of his Superiours? But he tells us, his own *dim* light, his *judicium rationale*, shines brighter in the closet of his own bosom, than 400. candles, or the *judicium forensē* of a Convocation; and so in contradiction to his own assertion he is determined not by the *lesser* light but the greater, not by the weaker judgment but the stronger. I'll adde but this; If he confines his eyes to his own *dim* light, and shuts his closet-doors to keep out the light of the Sun, or those 400. candles, he deserves to walk on in darkness. Secondly, he goes about to impose upon his Reader, by his comparison of a corporal and a spiritual eye; for though mine own eye be the best guide of my own steps to the body, yet it is not so to the soul. That promise of the Lord,

I will guide thee with mine eye, hath matter of an higher comfort in it. This will appear further by the evidence that, Thirdly, he doth *interfere* with Gods holy word and ordinance: For 1. *that self-denial* which the Gospel calls for doth extend (and not without reason) to *persinacy* in our opinions; and if there be not some kind of mortification of our own carnal judgments, we shall many times be tempted to cry out against the Orders of our Superiours, in as great a transportation as Naaman did in another case, *Are not Abana and Pharpar rivers of Damascus better than all the waters of Israel? may I not wash in them and be clean?* But why are we forbid to be *wise in our own conceits*, and to lean to our own understanding, and commanded to be *wise unto sobriety*? It was the saying as well as the observation of a wise and pious person*, *He that is his own scholar, hath a fool to his master*: and Solomons meaning is the same when he saith, * *Seest thou a man that is wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him.* And now, Mr. Applicant, you may walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that you have kindled; but remember there is a *wo* denounced against those that are *wise in their own eyes*: and therefore retract the arrogance of that expression in comparison of your Superiours, [*Though my dim light seeth not more, it seeth more truly and more directly than their brighter.*] This shews no great willingness to be convinced. For 2. this doth *interfere* with Gods holy ordinance; for why did he set up a candlestick and provide lights in his Church? why does he make it the peoples duty to *seek the law at the Priests lips*? why did he command, *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves*? why did God make that promise, and instance in it as such a signal blessing, *Thine eyes shall see thy teachers*? After all this provision, these commands and promises, must every man be allowed to be his own guide, and to do what is right

RO. 12. 16.

PROV 3. 5. 7.

* Qui se sibi

magistrum

constituit,

stulto se di-

scipulum

subdit. Bern.

capit. 87.

* PRO. 16. 12.

Isa. 50. 11.

Isa. 5. 21.

Word.

pag. 4.

Isa. 30. 20.

Ibid. 21.

in his own eyes? 'Tis not the light within thee, but the voice behind thee, (and that may be the voice of the rod too, the most proper instrument to be used upon them that turn their backs upon their governours) that is designed by Almighty God to reduce such as turn out of the way to the right hand or to the left. And seeing this is Gods acknowledged institution and ordinance, be not faithless, but Trust in the Lord with all thy heart, and lean not to thine own understanding.

Prov. 3. 5.

But you instance, [The learned Davenant hath taught me, *Men may guide us judicio ministeriali; but every one must judge idiosyncrasi; & anepalixis, judicio privato & practica discretionis: Tea, he hath concluded. (you say) ad nudam prescriptionem aut determinationem alterius, sine lumine privati judicii, nemo est qui credere potest, etiamsi cupiat maxime.*] But who doth debar you the use of your judgment of discretion? or who requires from you a brutish obsequiousness to their naked prescriptions and determinations without reason? If you value the judgment and piety of that learned Prelate, why do you not follow it in your practice? Certainly in matters doubtful and indifferent he resolves, that every mans discretion should determine him to subscribe to the judgment and orders of his Superiours. You cannot be ignorant of his constant practice in point of Liturgy, and for the Ceremonies in use amongst us, you have his Determination out of the Chair as Professor, which concludes thus, *Sive igitur potestatem obligantis, sive qualitates ceremoniarum, sive modum obligationis spectemus, Ecclesia Anglicana iustissime obligat ad ceremonias.*

Deter. q. 20.
p. 101.

But from the major R. S. proceeds to deny the minor, viz. That to stated Forms, &c. I may lawfully be determined by a weaker judgment, (viz.) my own. But, Sir, saith this Replicant to the Doctor, that you may know a man of intolerable pride, in your account, I deny your Minor, and tell you

you in general, *That the private judgment of a single person may be stronger than the judgment of a Convocation or whole Council.*] But this Answer doth not contradict the Doctors Proposition, and therefore it is nothing to the purpose. But besides, the Replicant may remember an old Axiom in the Schools, *A posse ad esse non valet consequentia*: his *may-be's* are not cogent arguments ordinarily: *Plus vident duo quàm unus oculus*; which may be rendered in the words of Solomon, *In the multitude of counsellours there is safety.* But he proceeds to instance, [*Have you never read of one Gamaliel in the Convocation* (but why not rather the ASSEMBLY?) *of the Scribes and Pharisees? or of one Cranmer in the Six-Articles Council of King Henry the Eighth? or of one Paphnutius in the Council of Nice?*] Well, we have read of these persons; but what then? For *Cranmer*, though but a single person, yet he was an *Archbishop*; and you should do well to remember that for the honour of that Order; and yet that is but one example, and *One Swallow will not make a Summer*; nor can you make *fair weather*, to adorn your pretensions, of your other Instances; for the text tells you, that *all the Council* agreed to *Gamaliel*, (and some one single person must break the ice in every debate;) and yet should those in Authority prove so very *Jews*, as to deny *Christ* to be the *Messias*, and silence the *holy Gospel*, you may be allowed to be singular in your *zele*, and start up the *Gamaliel* in the *Convocation* of *Scribes and Pharisees*. For *Paphnutius*, I wonder you should set his single judgment in opposition to that whole *Council*; for though he first took up the debate, yet the story tells us, the whole *Council* concurr'd with him in that business.

PROV 11. 14.
24. 6.

AGS 5.

I could (were I so disposed) tell you of *Jahn of Leiden*, *Hacket*, and other (of your *self-magnifying Lights*) Heads of pernicious *Factions*, and so give you a *Rowland* for your

Oli-

Oliver; but I desire you at least to remember, that it was the *Fathers* of the Church in council that blasted the most damnable heresies that were broched from time to time by single *Presbyters*, or others.

But *R. S.* goes on, and tells the Doctor, *If (you have) not (read of Paphnutius, and the rest) give us leave to tell you, we hope you will not from Archdeacon rise to be Archbishop; which if you should, we should fear to be forced to pluck out our eyes, because you say they are weaker than yours, now you are set above us. Let, Sir, junior Soph, judge whether you have not disputed like the master of much reason.*]

But, good Mr. *R. S.* whatever indignation you have to the Archdeacon, you should not slander him; he no where saith (as you suggest) *that your eyes are weaker than his now he is set above you*; but this he must say, that there are some set as well above himself as you, who are very much more quick-sighted than you both; and I hope he is so charitable, he would not pluck out your eyes, but open them, that having the like apprehensions of it with himself, you may be induced to comply with him in your submission to their Authority. For they doubtless have the advantage of situation, and are nearer to Almighty God in place; and if that signifies nothing, the promises of Gods assistance to men in office are of none effect.

But *R. S.* resolves now to be honest: he tells the Doctor, [*I will give you your due, you do strike at the principle which is the radix of Mr. Croftons argumentation;*] but withall he adds, that the Doctor is no skilful Carpenter, his blow doth neither reach the root nor shake the tree; and thus he proves it, [*“Mr. Crofton argues, Ministerial modification of publick worship by personal abilities, is the formal act of the Ministerial office; and he puts his Respondent to assign any other: You (the Doctor, saith he) most profoundly answer by denial, and then assign Ministerial*

“*stration* to be the formal act of the Ministerial office. Mr. Crofton I know (say you) will admit your *action* in the genus; an inferior Minister of State or servant in a family must minister as well as a Minister of the Gospel; but that *specific* act which shall difference the *special ministrations* of these *special relations* and *several capacities*, was the thing inquired; and what is the *formalis ratio* of the Ministerial office in the *ministration* of solemn public worship, is the question. To tell us, *Ministration* is the formal act of *Ministration*, is good Scepticism; *Dolosus versatur in generalibus*: the formal act of the Ministerial office is to minister, but *quomodo?* is the question. To hold your Lord Bishops stirrup, or the candle to an Archdeacon, will not sure fulfill the Ministry of a Gospel-Minister; yet it is *ministration*.]

Thus R. S. rants at the Doctor and the Hierarchy of the Church, as if the Covenant were yet in force, and an Ordinance for their eradication. Were I willing to return his sarcasm I would ask him this question, Whether a less penance than holding the Bishops stirrup can be inflicted upon persons that have been so violent to throw their Lordships out of the saddle? and do not they deserve to hold a candle to an Archdeacon, who have so long held one to the Devil to compass their designs? But I shall spare them, and apply my discourse to the Exceptions of this Replicant.

And first, whereas he excepts against the Doctor for saying that *Ministration* is the formal act of *Ministration*; this, I say, is false and groundless. 1. False; for the Doctor did not tell him that *Ministration* is the formal act of *Ministration*, but that *to minister* was the formal act of the Ministerial office. And therefore 2. his Exception is groundless*; for take [*ministration*] or [*to minister*] one-ly in that latitude and with the same limitation as Ministerial office is taken in Mr. Croftons Position, (when he saith,

*It is a rule in Logick, *Tota, nisi pr. dicatur, qualis patitur esse*
An subest.

An imposed Liturgy is destructive to the formal act of the Ministerial office) and his pretended scepticism is vanished; here is then as little room for this *Dolosus* to dance in, as for his cavil.

But whereas 2. he defines *the formal act of the Ministerial office* to be *the ministerial modification of publick worship by personal abilities.*] To this I answer,

1. If by *ministerial modification of publick worship* he had meant onely the performance of the duties of publick worship; then I should have told him, those duties are performed by *personal abilities* in the use of an *imposed Liturgy*. The understanding, will and affections, as they are required by Almighty God, so are they employed and exercised in such an *imposed Service*. If the Priest reads the *Forms* out of a book, his eyes are his own; if he takes the pains to get them without book, (which is more pains than to pour out such as the *Fancy* shall suggest *extempore*) his memory is his own; and so he performs the duty by his own *personal abilities*.

But by *modification of publick worship* he means the private composition of *Forms* for publick worship, and by his own *personal abilities* this *Replicant* understands principally the exercise of his *Invention*; for his words are these, [Mr. *Crofton* doth not exclude *his own judgment* when he pleads for the liberty of his own *Invention* to compose and modify his forms of publick worship.] He saith, he doth not exclude his judgment, but it is the liberty of his *Invention* he pleads for. Yes forsooth, these are the shrines that bring no small gains to these craftsmen; and they must contend for the liberty of their own *Invention* to make such shrines to serve the dosage of their superstitious Confidants.

Act's 19. 24.

But if it be not a breach of the holy commandment thus to set up and worship their own *Imaginations*, (as that renowned * Bishop long ago observed) I know not what the Commandment signifies. For the command requires as well

* B. Andr.
Sermon on
Acts 2. 42.

well the *affection* of the *spirit* as the *understanding* of the *mind* in prayer : but as the *Romanists*, by setting their people to pray they wote not what, make their *understanding* *unfruitful*, contrary to the Scripture; so these men, by giving themselves to *imagine* prayer at the same instant, they do so occupy their mind with *devising* what to say next, that their *spirit* is *unfruitful*, contrary to the very same Scripture ; as that reverend and learned Prelate more at large expresseth it.

1 Cor. 14.
14. 15.

See Pulpit-
Concep-
tions Popu-
lar Decep-
tions, p. 19,
&c.

But seeing it is the use of their *Invention* that Mr. Crofton and R. S. so earnestly plead for, I hope for the future they will lay aside their pretension of *praying by the Spirit*; and consequently silence those old complaints, That the *Spirit* is *limited* by an *imposed Liturgy*: for we see by this Confession (extorted by the power of Truth) that it is nothing else but the *limiting* of their *Invention*.

But 3. if the *formal act* of the *Ministerial office* be the *modification* of the duty by *personal abilities*, (i. e.) by the *wit* and *invention* of the Minister; then the *Prophets* and *Apostles* failed in the very *formal act* of their *Ministerial office* in Gods service; they did not perform it by *such* personal abilities, for *holy men of God* *speak* (not after their own *inventions*, but) *as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. And as to the *formal act* of *Ministration*, what difference is there betwixt a *Form* immediately *inspired* of the Holy Ghost, and one prepared by the *study* and *prudence* of our Superiours, whom God hath set over us? I say, as to the *formal act* of *Ministration*; for the *worship* or *service* of God administered in these cases, is no more *modified* by *personal abilities* in the one than in the other.

2 Pet. 1. ult.

4. Again, you confess [*the formal act of the Ministerial office is to minister*] but then you adde [*quomodo?* is the question] and so you run from the *quid sit?* to the *quomodo sit?* which is no regular way of arguing. For, as the

pag. 4.

Doctor said truly, to make *the modification* of the *act* the *act* it self, is as much as to make the *apparel* the *man*. This absurdity you endeavour to evade by saying [*modification of Ministration* came not into the question; but that *modification of solemn worship* is the *formal act of Ministration*, was and is asserted.] But then if this be the definition of the *formal act of Ministration*, what is the *genus* of it? The single term [*modification*] cannot be it; for that hath reference (as you confess) * to the adjunct qualities; [*gravity of expression, fervency of affection, and reverence in demeanour*] yea unto those rude methods, indigested raw expressions, tautologies, solecisms and disorders, which a Minister may utter in his prayers, as Mr. Croston confesseth: and such *modification of the act* cannot be the *genus* of it. You must therefore adde some other word to it to make it serviceable to you instead of a *genus*; and what must that be but those terms [*of solemn worship*?] so that [*modification of solemn worship*] is your *genus*; and if so, then the Doctor will demand what is the *specific difference* that doth distinguish the *Ministration* you undertake to define from *Ministration in the general*? You have nothing left but your *personal abilities*; and consequently the difference in this your so much magnified Definition (*of the formal act of Ministration*) doth not distinguish your *Ministration in Gods solemn worship* from your *holding the stirrup* to the Lord Bishop, or the *candle* to the Archdeacon, or the Tailors *shaping his apparel*; for these are all performed by *personal abilities*.

And therefore I cannot grant that *the modification of publick worship by personal abilities* is the *formal act of the Ministerial office*: it is Mr. Crostons duty, and the duty of his Advocate to prove it, (and till that be done, their Argument is invalid) for *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*. But, to return R. S. his own words, we must believe it on the
ma.

* A Word
and a Blow,
pag. 17, 18.

magisterial confident say-so of this great Dictator.

And because I see this is made their last refuge, which they flee to as a *sanctuary* to shelter them from the *imposition* of the *Liturgy*, I shall take a little more pains to demolish it, by proving the Proposition it self to be *improbable* and *absurd*, *false* and *scandalous*; which I shall endeavour by these Arguments.

1. That Opinion that hath no ground in *Scripture*, *Antiquity* or *Reason*, is *improbable*.

This Opinion, That *modification* of publick worship by personal abilities is the *formal act* of the *Ministerial office* hath no ground in *Scripture*, *Antiquity* or *Reason*.

Therefore this Opinion, That *modification* of publick worship by personal abilities is the *formal act* of the *Ministerial office*, is *improbable*.

1. This Opinion hath no ground in *Scripture*; for therein the use of Forms of *prayer*, *praise* and *benediction*, is prescribed to such as are engaged in the *Ministerial office*; and sure the Holy Ghost in *Scripture* would prescribe nothing destructive to the *formal act* of that Office.

2. It hath no ground in *Antiquity*; for there we find the use of *Forms* and a *Liturgy* composed and prescribed from time to time. [“An Order and regular Method of “Praying, Reading the Scriptures, and Administration of “other parts of Worship, in convenient time and order, “successively each after other in their proper place: This “Mr. Croston* confesses to have been used in all Churches “of Jews or Christians.”] But let him shew that there was ever such a *method* and *order* without the very *modification* and *form* it self, till the late *Directory*.

* Position, pag. 1.

3. This Opinion hath no ground in *Reason*; for to the clearest light of *Reason* it appears to be 1. *absurd*, 2. *false*, and 3. *scandalous*; and it is evinced to be so by these following Arguments.

I. Ab-

Conformity re-asserted.

1. *Absurd*, which is proved thus :

That Opinion that placeth devotion and the *solemn worship* of God in prayer chiefly in the exercise of the *Invention*, is *absurd*.

This Opinion, that *the modification of publick worship by personal abilities is the formal act of the Ministerial office*, placeth devotion and the *solemn worship* of God in prayer chiefly in the exercise of the *Invention*.

Therefore this Opinion, that *the modification of publick worship by personal abilities is the formal act of the Ministerial office*, is *absurd*.

The *major* cannot reasonably be denied, and the *minor* is confessed by R. S. and Mr. Crofton, (*ut supra*.)

2. This Opinion is *false and scandalous*, which appears thus :

That Opinion that makes the use of the *Lords prayer*, or of any *Psalms of David*, as a *Form*, *destructive* to, or *inconsistent* with, the *formal act of the Ministerial office*, is *false and scandalous*.

This Opinion, that *modification of publick worship by personal abilities is the formal act of the Ministerial office*, makes the use of the *Lords prayer*, or of any *Psalms of David*, as a *Form*, *destructive* to, or *inconsistent* with, the *formal act of the Ministerial office*.

Therefore this Opinion, that *the modification of publick worship by personal abilities is the formal act of the Ministerial office*, is *false and scandalous*.

These Propositions are both so evident, they need no further confirmation.

I shall adde but one Argument more against this Doctrine, which is this ;

That which is inevitably prejudicial to the people, either by involving them in the *guilt* of all that *non-sense and indiscretion, sedition and blasphemy*, which the Minister many times

times runs into in his *conceived* prayers, or by interrupting and disturbing them in the performance of Gods publick worship, that is not the *formal act* of the *Ministerial office*.

But the *modification* of publick worship by *personal* abilities is inevitably prejudicial to the people, either by involving them in the *guilt* of all that *non-sense* and *indiscretion*, *sedition* and *blasphemy*, which the Minister many times runs into in his *conceived* prayers, or by interrupting and disturbing them in the performance of Gods publick worship.

Therefore the *modification* of publick worship by *personal* abilities is not the *formal act* of the *Ministerial office*.

The *major* cannot be denied without scandal.

The *minor* is evident; for either the people do not joyn in the *Forms* of publick worship, where *non-sense* and *indiscretion*, *sedition* and *blasphemy* are uttered; and then (if they do not take the name of God in vain) they are at least interrupted and disturbed in the performance of Gods publick worship. Or else they do joyn in it, and then (if the people love to have it so) they are involved in the *guilt* of all that *non-sense* and *indiscretion*, *sedition* and *blasphemy*, which the Minister many times runs into in his *conceived* prayers. This R. S. took notice of when he wrote *Fernbbaal justified*, and therefore he saith, [If the people have a publick judgment of the ministerial mode of Gods worship, we are under a necessity of having what we so much complain against, and cast off, (viz.) a fixed Liturgy; for the mode of Prayer, Preaching, ministration of Sacraments, must then be known to the people, and judged by them free from all defect and disorder, before the people can attend Gods worship in that ministration.] And a little after, [No serious sober Christian can think the people to be guilty of those rude methods, indigested raw expressions, tautologies, solecisms and disorders, which a Minister may utter in his Preach-

Preaching and Praying; yet this is inevitable, (saith R. S.) if the people have a publick judgment by special office of the Ministerial mode of Gods worship.] But it is not the peoples want of a publick judgment by special office that will keep them from the guilt; their judgment of discretion, if they consent to it, will certainly make them guilty; and if they consent not, (when they come with a hearty devotion, finding that they cannot do it conscientiously) they are then interrupted and distracted in their duty, the performance of Gods publick worship; they cannot perform it with such persuation of faith, such intencion of mind, such fervency of affection, as they may do by a composed Form, which they know and are well assured of aforehand.

But (if *modification by personal abilities*) if that be not it, (to save himself a labour, which he knows he is not able to accomplish) he calls upon his *Antagonist* to assign what is the formal act of the Gospel ministerial office, what will specifically difference it from *Ministration* in the general; and if it may contribute to his satisfaction, I shall readily obey his command, and tell him from the Holy Ghost in Scripture that it is *αἱγιαζῶν τοὺς κληρικοὺς*. If you will have it more fully, it is *The Ministration of a person duly admitted into holy Orders^a, performed to the glory of God^b and the benefit of his Church^c, by a Form prescribed either^{*} immediately^d by God himself, or by such as are clothed with^e Authority, according to the word of God.*

Acts 13.2.

^a Heb. 5.4. ^b Acts 13.2.
^c Heb. 5.1. * To this reduce inspiration.

^d Num. 6.23. Luke 11.2.

^e See Pulpit-Conceptions, pag. 56, 57, 58, 59, 60.

And now having not onely shaken the Tree, but grubb'd up (that which is acknowledged to be) the very root of Mr. Croftons Argumentation, the most difficult part of my task is dispatched.

But R. S. renews Mr. Croftons Objection in these words, [*Imposition and Prescription in Prayer and Sacraments is applicable to Preaching.*] To this the Doctor shaped a four-fold

fold Answer, and we must consider what R. S. hath replied to it. The Doctor saith,

1. *A Sermon is never the worse for being well digested.* To this R. S. replies, [*True, if it be the Preachers own meditation, much the better.*]

2. Saith the Doctor, *If it be seen and allowed by Authority, I know no harm in it.* R. S. replies, *Nor I neither; but this is not necessary.*

3. Saith the Doctor, *This course (if not endless) would more secure the peace and solid Edification of the Church.* Here R. S. begins to be transported, as if the Doctor had touch'd his Copy-hold, and falls foul upon that, which even now he confessed he knew no harm in. For when the Doctor affirms, that if Sermons were *seen and allowed by Authority*, this course (if not endless) would the more secure the peace and Edification of the Church; R. S. replies with some bitterness, [*I deny that, unless by the Popish guard, Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion.*] But see how prejudice and passion have eclipsed his Reason; for what is there in the countenance of Authority to cherish Ignorance? Is not the Eye of a prudent Governour matter of incitation, and his approbation matter of encouragement? and consequently then they must needs conduce to the advancement of Knowledge not of Ignorance. But R. S. (you must know) is a very able Scholar, and if need be, to affront his Adversary, he can bring in Proverbs by head and shoulders; and thus, having got a considerable interest in the Popish guard, he doth press and muster some of their Forces for his own service, and this amongst the rest [*Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion.*]

And is not this the Presbyterian as well as the Popish guard? What think you of Mr. Case, who calling upon his Auditors to pursue Rebellion in hopes of finding out a Reformation, he tells them, they must, after the example of

See the
Doctors
Answer.
p. 55, 56.

Abraham, go at great uncertainties (and) they knew not whether. He thought they might possibly meet with as good fortune in following *Hugh Peter's Asses*, as *Saul* did in seeking of his Father's.

"But Sir (saith the *Replicant*) what are these to a Sermon not studied, much less digested by the Preacher? [As little I confess, as this is to the Controversie in hand; but you adde] "not communicated to, but composed by "pretenders to Authority: making Ministers to have no "work to do, qua Ministers, but to read what they have written, which is the Nature and Form of Homilies, and these "exclusively imposed, which may as well be admitted as the Liturgy.]

To this I answer. 1. That R. S. his calling the Governours of the Church pretenders to Authority, is highly Schismatical and Seditious, and smells rank of the second Article of the Solemn League and Covenant. 2. That Homilies are composed to take men off from their study and diligence, who are apt to teach in their own personal capacity, is very false; and that such Homilies are or will be exclusively imposed, is maliciously or scandalously suggested. 3. That Sermons exclusively imposed may as well be admitted as the Liturgy is false, and nothing is offer'd in proof of it.

But the Doctor answered, 4. That when the Presbyterians preach other mens printed Sermons, this is no prejudice to the interest of those Souls that hear them.] To this R. S. replies, ["Name any such who do so, (preach other "mens printed Sermons) let them bear their blame; I know "no Presbyterians who so do: But if you Sir please to inquire in the Parish of *Christs-Church*, or *Martins-Ludgate* "London, or *Henly* in *Sussex*, you may hear of Sons of the "Church who stuck not to preach Mr. *Croftons* own printed Sermons: But these are preparing for Homily-ministrations.]

In

In good time: But 1. If the persons you insinuate to be guilty of this *Plagiarism*, did *modify* his Sermons handsomely by their own *personal abilities*, (in the delivery of them) Mr. *Crofton* was beholden to them for being his *Rehearers*; and their *Memory* is no less to be admired than his *Invention*. But 2. Did they preach his Sermons *Verbatim*? If they made no use of their *judgment* to avoid the *Sedition* (usual in his discourses) assure your self they were no right *Sons* of the Church of *England*. 3. This might be a prudent design in them to try the judgment of their *Auditors*, whether it were the *Doctrine* or the *Person* they had in admiration: For we find many times it is not so much the *matter* as the *gestures* of the Preacher, with his *tone*, and the *Emphasis* of his words that makes the Impression upon a *soft-headed* people; And there is no better way to *shame* them out of their *Fanaticism*, than to *convince* them (by such instances) that they do *slight* or *reverence* the very *same* *Doctrine*, (and therefore not out of judgment, but) according to the *opinion* they have of the *Person* that doth deliver it.

4. I demand of *R. S.* whether *those* Sermons had the *same effect* upon the Hearers, when preached by those *Plagiarists*, which they had when they were preached by Mr. *Crofton* himself? If they had, then there is as much *virtue* towards *Salvation* in a discourse framed to my hand, as is in those of my own *composition*; and consequently the fault is not in the *thing* it self, but only in the *Laziness* of the Man that has *personal abilities* and neglecteth to exert them for the Service of the Church; if they had not the *same virtue*, then the *efficacy* of the *Ministry* is *ex opere operantis*, from the *intention* and *quality* of the *Minister*; and so *R. S.* falls in to the *Popish guard* again. Lastly, we must take notice, that in vilifying *Homily-ministrations* (as he calls them) he puts contempt (in effect) upon

ACTS 15. 21.

the Reading of the Holy Scriptures. But this the Holy Ghost accounts a kind of preaching; For Moses in old time hath in every City them that preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath-day. These Preachments we are sure are nothing else but the Word of God; but those other, though the Ordinance of God, yet are they subject to more perversities, and many times men give so much way to their own passions and conceits in them, that they are nothing less than that pure word.

But to proceed, [you think (saith R. S.) there is a vast difference between Praying and Preaching; is there not also a difference between these and Sacraments?] Yes, but what then? make your inference and we shall find you an answer.

R. S. goes on, and bids the Doctor [“prove that Christ taught that Prayer may be comprised in a short Office: He suggested matter, did he determine the mode, terms, words, and expressions of Prayer? If not, what avails this Plea?”] So R. S. disputeth.

But what need this Replicant bid the Doctor prove that Christ taught that prayer may be comprised in a short Office? Hath he not taught this by an example? Sure, when he gratified the piety of his Disciples inquiry after instruction in this point, he did not for a pattern, what the Pharises did for a pretence when they devour'd widows houses; he did not make a long prayer. No, if we may believe Mr. Croftons Advocate, the Church of God hath been mistaken more than 1606. years: For, saith he, Christ suggested Matter, (but) did he determine the mode, terms, words, and expressions of Prayer? If not, saith he, what avails this plea? You say right Sir, but in good earnest are you grown so great a proficient in Reformation, that you have forgotten your Pater-Noster? Or, how came you by that notion (so long concealed from all the blessed Saints

saints and Martyrs of Jesus Christ) that the *Lords-Prayer* signifies no more than (the *Title of Pater-Noster-Row* in *London*) a direction where you may take up *Suffs* of all sorts, as you have occasion? Can you understand *common sense*? What is the meaning of [*when ye pray say, [OUR FATHER WHICH ART IN HEAVEN, &c?]*] Did not our Saviour herein direct them to a *Form*? Did he not determine the *mode, terms, words, and expressions of Prayer*? If he did not (in that instance) for my part, I shall despair of ever understanding any single Sentence of the Holy Gospel.

But (saith *R. S.*) there are not more *various Texts* in the Bible, than *wants* in the Church, and *both are the Scene for variety of gifts to exercise upon.*] How? not more *various Texts* than *wants*? have you computed their number? Are there not at least a *Million* of such *Texts*? Are there not some thousands in one Book of Holy Scripture? If the *wants* of the Church be so many, (I demand of this *Replicant*) must all these wants be *particularly* enumerated in our *Form* of Prayer, or no? If they must, that *Form* of prayer (that contains an enumeration of so many particulars) cannot be much shorter than the whole Bible; and so long a *Form* is never fit for use, but in the *Quadragesimal* Fasts: I such a *particular* enumeration be not necessary (which indeed *R. S.* makes impossible) but the wants of the Church may be recommended to God in *General*; then why not in a *prescrib'd Liturgy*? For Gods part, being the *Ancient of days*, and knowing our thoughts *long before*, he can no more be taken with the *novelty* than with the *elegancy* of our expressions. And for man, that *variety of Conceptions* (so earnestly contended for) hath more of *temptation and peril*, but not more of *real advantage*, than a *prescrib'd Liturgy*, as the Doctor hath sufficiently evinced in other Papers *. Prayers are intended for

* Pulpit-
Concep-
tions.

an exercise of *Devotion*, not of *Wis*; not to *inform* our Maker, but to perform a *duty* of Solemn Worship that we may move him to be gracious. [The Title of the 102. *Psalm* is [A prayer for the afflicted when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord.] Is this *Psalm* generally suitable to the state of the afflicted, and fit to exercise his Devotions? if it be, then there is no need of such an enumeration of particular wants as you speak of; if it be not, in saying so, you blame the Holy Ghost for inspiring such a *Form* for the use of the afflicted as is not suitable to the variety of Subjects and Conditions.

“But Sir, (saith R. S.) your next makes work for the “*Terra filius*,] And why so? The Doctor told Mr. Crofton [His instance of the Parish Clerk and people, was neither to our prejudice nor to his purpose; for they are a general part of the holy Priesthood St. Peter speaketh of, and it is their duty to bear a part in Gods solemn Worship.] Here R. S. cries out [well level’d Doctor, I hope we shall no more hear of Clergy distinct from Laity: The Parish Clerk and people are part of the Holy Priesthood; very true, (saith R. S.) [They ought to bear a part in Gods Solemn Worship; undoubtedly true (saith he:) But must that part be Ministration? Such Ministration as is the formal act of Gospel-ministry?] No, the Doctor never said it was; and therefore R. S. might have spared his out-cry in these words, [and if so, farwel holy Orders, gra, solemn Ordination to the Ministry; a man may make himself a Priest: Enter Independency, the Arch-deacon hath opened the door. All the Lords people are holy, the holy Priesthood; Ergo may Minister in the Ministers Office.] Thus R. S. suffers his tongue and pen to run riot for lack of the words of truth and soberness to stop them.

But, saith R. S. to the Doctor, either (you say) so, [that the Part the Parish-Clerk and the People bear in Gods Solemn Worship is Ministration] or, you have said nothing]

thing] yes, altogether as much as he had need to say upon that account.

The Doctor did distinguish the *Ministerial Office* and the *Ministerial Act* as well as Mr. Crofton; and had you not shut your eyes on purpose, you must have seen it; for he told you, *we must not so look to personal abilities as to forget* Antidote
p. 116.
Divine Ordination.

If Mr. Crofton does not allow *personal abilities* to confer an *Office*, what does he infer from the abilities of the *Boy* to read, and the *Parish Clerk* to say *Amen*? That the Office of a *Gospel-minister* imports a *greater work* than what is *performable* by *ordinary* people, the Doctor doth allow you; and he hath told you what that work is, in his *Pulpit-Conceptions*.

You may boast what you please of your *Reply*, but for all *this* (your *Vindication*) Mr. Crofton appears still to be *self-condemned*; And what ever your *Fury* of *freshmen* do by the Doctors *Logick*, I am sure a *Fury* of good *Casuits* will condemn your *Divinity*: And yet whoever has your *Vote* for the Office of *Senior Lecturer*, such is the *height* of your *insolence*, you will keep the *scorners Chair* to your self.

But I am weary of *R. S.* his *vanity*, and therefore I shall proceed presently to make good the Doctors undertaking, *viz.* That Mr. Crofton and his party are bound to *submit to the use of a prescrib'd Liturgy*.]

This the Doctor proves (by this *Medium*) because it is *morally possible*; And this he proves (by this *Medium*) because it is *not sinful*; And this he makes good (by this *Medium*) because it is *forbidden by no Law*.]

And here we are to joyn issue. For *R. S.* denies *This*, (which was the *major Proposition* of the Doctors *sylogism*) and saith, that to *submit to the use of a prescrib'd Liturgy* is forbidden in the *First Commandment*, which doth
require:

require *faithfulness* in the Office committed to us by the Lord himself; *Ministers of God* cannot without sin become the *Ministers of men*.] Thus disputes the *Replicant*.

Tarker.

But what! To submit to the use of a *prescrib'd Liturgy* forbidden in the *First Commandment*? Some men have an art to infer *Quidlibet ex quolibet*, like the man that could find the *sign of the Cross* to be a sin against every one of the *ten Commandments*. [The *First Commandment* is this, [Thou shalt have no other Gods before me. This *Replicant* infers, Ergo, Thou shalt not submit to the use of a *prescrib'd Liturgy*.] Is this good *Logick*? Just such Arguments we find in the Church of Rome; *Rogavi pro te (Petre) ne deficeret fides tua*, and again, *Pasce oves meas*; Ergo, *Papa est Judex Controversiarum*. Truly, in such Inferences as these the Consequences are so remote there is need of more than an ordinary sagacity, (such as that of R. S.) to discern them. What you object against the Doctor is now very applicable to your self, *Dolosus versatur in generalibus*.

But suppose the Doctor should put you in mind of the *First Commandment*, and tell you, that by the duty you owe unto Almighty God (required in that Commandment) you are obliged to submit to the use of a *prescrib'd Liturgy*; would not his consequence be as rational as yours? If this Deduction be remote and doubtful, so is yours too; and whose judgment shall we rely upon in this case? You cannot be so irrational (if you be a man) as to think we ought to rely on yours, because you are a *Party*; and you will plead that the Doctor is so too, and consequently it is no less unreasonable that you should rely on his; and what will follow from hence but a necessity of our reliance (for peace and order sake) upon the Authority of the Church, as well in opposition to the *Schismatical Inferencer* as to the *Fanatick Enthusiast*? Thus that Learned Professor in his Lecture (*De Autoritate Ecclesia in rebus Fidei*) hath determined

terminated : For, he observes, *ut de illuminatione Spiritus in libris defendendis, potest esse dissensus, quia unusquisq; Fanaticus jactabit suum Spiritum: Ita etiam in Consequentiis deducendis ex indubitatis principiis, oriatur lris de Syllogismo, an secundum rectam rationem contextatur. Quoniam que tibi videtur recta ratiocinatio, alius pugnabit, non esse rectam, & sic nunquam erit Contentionis periodus.* The difference therefore must be decided by a more competent *Judicature*, that is, by *Authority*.

And now I shall tell this bold *Champion*, that the *First Commandment* doth require his *submission* to the use of a *prescrib'd Liturgy*; at least the *First Commandment with promise*: For that *Commandment* saith [*Honour thy Father and thy Mother,*] *The Prince and the Church*; whose duty it is to see, that (in Gods service) all things be done *decently and in order*, to the *Glory of God and the Edification* of his people. If our *Liturgy* were designed to this end, (and your *Superiours* do tell you it was *composed* upon no other account) you are *obliged* to the *Imposition*, as the *Doctor* hath elsewhere * maintain'd by *irrefragable Conclusions*.

* Pulpit-
Concep-
tions p. 58,
&c.

But you allege, That the *First Commandment* doth require *Faithfulness* in the Office committed to us by the Lord himself. But give me leave to ask you a question or two. What parts of the *Ministerial Office* are committed to you? and *how far*? and by *whom*? Sure your Power is not *unlimited*, nor your *Jurisdiction universal*. Was the Office committed to you *immediately* by God himself, or *mediately* by the Ministry of such as have a *higher Authority* than your self? Did they *understand* the *bounds* of your Office when they *Ordain'd* you? Is not *their Office* committed to them by the Lord himself as well as yours? Doth not the *First Commandment* concern them as well as you? and requires *Faithfulness* in *their Office* too? Why,

F

they

they will tell you, it is out of *Faithfulness* to the *Trust* reposed in them, and to discharge their Office, that they have composed and prescrib'd such a *Liturgie*. Do they aver this without Reason? Was the *Form* (you so caustically though furiously declaim against) imposed upon you without any previous examination or deliberate judgment? If this cannot be affirmed without impudence, then I ask further; have not they *Judicium Rationale & Discretionis privatæ*, a *Rational judgment of Discretion* as well as you? and is not that sufficient to satisfy their Conscience, as well as yours is to satisfy your own? This then puts them upon an equal competition, and makes the scales betwixt you and them hang even. Where then is your common justice with your private judgment? Is there no allowance to be granted them upon the account of their Authority? If you be the Author of *Ferubbaal* justified, therein you acknowledge a judgment of office armed with a moral power which the people have not, [pag. 17, and 18.] and (pag. 35.) you say, though the *forum* of the Church visible be changeable and is changed, yet it consisteth (even now) of such, who are true and lawful (though it may be not pious) *Ministers of the Gospel*, and these you confess are *Judges*: And what must their *Judicium forense & Decisionis Publicæ*, their legal Authority and publick Decision stand for nothing? Or is it a sufficient security to your Conscience to confront your *Christian liberty* to their Authority? If your *Creed* be of the same dimensions with the *Confession of Faith* advised by the *Assembly*, you believe otherwise; for they confess, That they who upon pretence of *Christian Liberty* shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be *Civil or Ecclesiastical*, resist the Ordinance of God;] and then you may learn from the Apostle what will follow, *Rom. 13. 2.*

But you add [*Ministers of God cannot without sin become the*

the Ministers of men.] How? not the Ministers of men? Had not the men of *Salamis* John to their Minister? Are there not some men of whom the Lord himself affirms, *I have said ye are Gods?* You will make them sorry Gods indeed (and you are very well acquainted how your confederates used his late Majesty) if you allow them no Ministers in their utmost exigencies.

But perhaps your meaning is good, though your words be liable to exception. If your *sense* be this, that we ought not to resign our selves up in a blind obedience to the Magisterial dictates of men, without any examination whether they be consonant to Gods word or otherwise, I do readily subscribe to it.

For (1) if there should happen to be a competition between them in matters clearly determined in Holy Scripture, or evidently consequential to any divine determination, it is our acknowledged duty to obey God rather than men. But this Rule ties you up more indispensably to the commands of your Superiours in all cases wherein God hath made no such exception; for [*Exceptio firmat regulam in Casibus non exceptis.*] If therefore you have any such exception in the Case of a prescribed Liturgy, produce it in Gods name; for your Governours will tell you that God commands your obedience to their injunctions; and he having invested them with Authority over you, they are by that means possesse of a right to command you from God himself. In this case how can you supersede their power? If you pretend to a Divine Authority to justify your disobedience, you allege no more than what they really have to command you. And then, unless the Authority you pretend to, be more evident for you, than that by which they claim their power to command you, is for them: it remains at least doubtful on which side the Right lies; whether on your Governours side who command, or on yours that

refuse obedience; and in all *doubtful Cases*, it is an acknowledged Rule, *Potior est pars possidentis*; the presumption is always for those in Authority, else Peace and Order must expire.

But besides (2) in *doubtful matters*, who should we have recourse unto but to such as are most versed in that faculty, that examines them? We should consult the *Physician* for our *Health*, and the *Lawyer* for our *Title to an Estate*; but we have all the reason in the world to trust the *Divine* with our *Case of Conscience*. The learned *Davenant* (as you deservedly style him) hath soberly determin'd in this particular; *Pendere (Deus ipse) voluit fidem Ecclesia sua ab absolutâ Authoritate Prædicantium: Voluit (tamen) uti Ministerio hominum in verbi salutiferi prædicatione; voluit etiam ab omnibus Christianis horum Ministrorum vocem cum debito honore atque summa reverentia audiri.* Can the Learning and Piety of that Reverend Prelate prevail with you? Behold (in your Opinion perhaps) a greater than *Davenant* is here, we have even Mr. *Baxter* * himself our *Suffragane* in this Article; he tells his Brethren of the Ministry, [though he denies them to have either Credit or Authority against the known word of God, yet so great is their Credit and Authority even as Teachers and Guides of the Church in Cases agreeable to the word, and in Cases to the people doubtful and unknown, and in Cases left by the word to their determination, (the word determining them but generally) that he thinks the ignorance of this truth hath been the main Cause of our sad Confusions and Schisms in England; and that the Ministers have been guilty of it; and that till we have better taught even our Godly people, what Credit and Obedience is due to their Teachers and Spiritual Guides, the Church of England shall never have Peace or any good or establish'd Order, &c.] As is more fully cited in the very next page before [Mr. *Croftons* Position examined.]

* Note-gay
to Mr. Carl
p. 83.

3. To keep out *Faction*, to prevent *Confusion*, and to preserve *Unity*, God hath been pleased to establish a *Subordination* of Ministers in his Church, as well under the *New* as under the *Old Testament* *. And as there is a *judgement of Discretion* that belongs to all, and a *judgement of Direction* that belongs to single *Presbyters*, so there is a *judgement of Jurisdiction* peculiar to the *Prelacy*. Every man for the *satisfaction* of his own *Conscience* may inquire and examine such *Doctrines*, *Rites*, and *Forms of Worship* as are *delivered* or *prescribed* to him; his *judgement of Discretion* is given him to this purpose; and he will pay his *submission* with the more *alacrity* to those whom God hath set over him, when he finds their *Discourses* and *Injunctions* consonant to *divine Revelations*. But what if upon such their *exploration* it should seem as well to some of those that have a *Directive judgment*, as to others who have only a *judgement of Discretion*, that some things are to be held or *practised* otherwise than their *Superiours* have *determined*? Why, in this Case *Christiana erit modestia diffidere potius privatæ perspicaciæ, quàm Reverendo Præ-* Dr. Brid. Lett. 22.
latorum cæsit (as that *Learned Professor* hath resolved) it becomes their *Christian modesty* rather to distrust their own private *in-sight* (into the nature of those particulars) than the *Reverend College* of their *Prelates*, to whom belongs the *judgment of Jurisdiction*. And if possibly they should apprehend some *manifest prevarication*, *non meditando statim schisma, sed communicandum in receptis*; *tolerandum, quod tolli non potest, & expectandum demum, & orandum, donec Deus suo tempore quod distortum est aut luxatum, legitima aliquâ Authoritate ac debitis mediis, in integrum restituat*. And this is not at all to become *sinful*, or the *servants of men*, but to walk *worthy of the Lord* unto all *pleasing*, and to keep the *unity of the Spirit* in the *bond of peace*, as becomes the *Gospel of Christ*, and *Gods Ministers*.

But

But if the *First Commandment* will not justify his *Non-submission* to Authority in the use of a *prescrib'd Liturgy*, he hath another *special Law* will do it; for he saith

2. *In speciality, the Law of the Ministerial office in its special nature (which must give Rules to the Ministers acts, qua Ministerial acts) doth forbid such submission, as inconsistent with, and destructive to the formal act of the Ministerial office, viz. Modifying worship by personal abilities, notwithstanding what our Opponent hath urged to the contrary.]*

To this I answer, That the *formal act of the Ministerial office* is not the *modifying of worship by personal abilities* (as hath been proved formerly) but is *consistent with and included in the performance of Gods Publick Worship and Service*, by a *Form prescrib'd*, either *immediately by God himself*, or by the *Church according to the word of God*. And I do challenge * this *Replicant* to produce his *special Law or prohibition* to the contrary. For what he adds is not of force against us; viz.

* See Pulpit-Concept. p. 56, 57.

That 3. *The edifying of the Church by variety of Ministerial gifts, is a Law which doth forbid such submission as destructive to that end.]* It seems your shift of Pasture makes fat Souls too; and then I wonder your Law doth not likewise forbid the settlement of any one single person over a particular Congregation; and injoin all Ministers to become *Itinerant*, that travelling up and down their variety of gifts may be the more diffused to the edifying of the Church. But if you take the *Liturgy prescrib'd* in the full extent of it, it allows you room enough in the *Pulpit*, and upon all *incidental occasions* to exercise your variety of gifts amongst the people. And if you refrain it to the several *Forms of Confession, Prayer, and Thanksgiving*, They are designed to exercise your heart rather than your brain, and it is their proper office to *edifie your Devotion* not your *Knowledge* *. And *prescrib'd Forms* are of so much

* Unless it be impetration of divine assistance.

much the more advantage to this effect, because the less the understanding is occupied to consider and invent the matter, the more intent and earnest are the will and affections (the most immediate instruments of Devotion) about the bodily duty it self, as hath been evinced elsewhere *.

But to follow this bold Champion; the Apostle indeed (saith he) bids us hold fast the Form of wholesome words, but not to hold to the same words; to speak the same things, but not in the same Syllables:]. And why so? Chermnitius * was of another mind touching the practice of our Saviour, and the duty of the Church: NULLUM DUBIUM est, eandem doctrinam, & easdem Conciones, iudem verbis sapius aliis atq; aliis temporibus & locis a Christo repetitas: There is no doubt but Christ did often repeat the very same Doctrine and the very same Sermons in the very same words at several times and places. Non enim valere debet in Ecclesia illud Rhetorum praeceptum, τὰ καινὰ κεινός. Sed illud Ιησέως potius valere debet, τὰ ἀντὰ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. For that rule of the Rhetorician should not prevail in the Church of God; [the affecting to cloath common truth in a new dress:] but that of Irenaeus should prevail rather, [the delivering of the same Article in the same expressions.] To write the same things unto you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe, saith the great Apostle; and words are not to be multiplied to no purpose.

But, if so, saith our Adversary, i. e. if we speak the same things in the same words, (then) the Liturgy must be Catholick to all Christians in all places and ages of the World, and that in the Greek language only.] To which I answer, 1. That if there were one Catholick language, such a Catholick Liturgy would be very desirable to all such as love to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace. O quam bonum & quam jucundum! But 2. because all the World

* Pulpit-
Concepti-
ons p. 19. to
45.

* Harm.
Evang. c. 51.
p. 522.

Phil 3. 1.

Entia non
sunt mul-
tiplicanda
sine necessi-
tate.

Psalm.

under-

a 1 Cor. 1.
10.

b 1 Cor. 14.
14, &c.

c Rom. 15.
6.

d 1 Cor. 1.
10.

understanding as well as with the heart and affections; therefore the same Apostle that requireth all to *speake the same thing* ^a, gives a warrant for *interpretation*, that all may be edified ^b. 3. It is observable, that his Direction is addressed, as his Epistle is, to a Church of *one denomination* and language; to the *Romans* ^c, to the *Corinthians* ^d, &c. 4. The Doctor does not contend for the absolute necessity of our prescribed *Liturgy*, but only for the *lawfulness* and expediency of it.

But our Antagonist goes on thus, [*had this Doctor read Mr. Croftons Argument on this Question against D. G. he sure would not have thus disputed.*] And why so? (he adds) *Submission to Superiours is a duty*;] a good confession if it were not for the *But* that follows, [*but our judicium rationale must judge their Mandate to be licitum & honestum, which in this Case we cannot do; and then our Dilemma is manifest, shall we obey God or man? judge you.*] But maugre this mans prejudice we have proved their *Mandate* in this case to be *licitum & honestum*, and therefore to resist it is neither more nor less than to resist the Ordinance of God.

* Reply to
S. C. &c.
p. 511.

But you were lately told upon another occasion *, that the defence of the Apostles [*we must obey God rather than man*] is *very unseemly in the mouths of Rebels.*] Neither will the horns of that *Dilemma* assist you in this encounter, for to secure your Conscience and warrant your Non-submission to your Governours, the evidence you produce to prove that it is Gods will you should not obey them in this instance, must be more clear and pregnant than those Testimonies that are pleadable for their Authority to command you; otherwise your Conscience if it be tender and awake to do its office, must needs be perplexed, scrupulous, and doubtful, unless you have drunk as deep of the Jesuits Cup in this Doctrine, as you have done in some others, and

and perswade your self, that in your practices relating to your Superiours you may govern your self by that *opinion* which is less *probable*; which course, how unreasonable, how unsafe and dangerous it is you are apt to proclame loud enough in other instances.

Your Governours command you to submit to the use of a *prescribed Liturgy*; you despise this command, and tell them you must *obey God rather than men*. Now the *quare* is, who hath the fairest Title to a *Divine Revelation* for their justification, whether your Governours for their *Command*, or you for your *Recusancy* and disobedience?

They allege the *prime, literal, and immediate* importance of the holy Text [*Let every Soul be subject to the higher powers, obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves.*] This is their *grand Charter* to command you, their *general Title* to require obedience from you; but where is your *Charter of Exemption*, your *privilege* that frees you from your duty in this instance? Doth the *superficies* your Conscience relies upon run in these (or the like) express and clear terms [*Do not obey them that have the rule over you. do not submit your selves in the use of a prescribed Liturgy?*] Had you such a *Divine Revelation* in the holy Text, then you had as fair a Title for your *Recusancy* as your Governours have for their *Command*. But you cannot, you dare not pretend to such a *Divine Dispensation* in this case. But what is the course you take? Why, turning your back upon the *clear light* that leads you to your duty, you betake your selves to the *obscure shades*, and serve your interest of any colour that you think will give a handsome *appearance* to your disobedience.

You are enjoined the use of a *prescribed Liturgy*, and flying from your duty, you take Sanctuary in the *First Commandment*, which, in the *first, literal, and immediate* importance of it, hath nothing to the purpose; and so your

appeal is made to a *Consequence*, which, if at all *deducible* from thence, is so *remote* and distant, that to most mens eyes it is *invisible*. Thus you forsake the good and *safe old way* *; you let go that which is *clear and certain*, to follow what is *obscure, doubtful, and uncertain*. Do you thus exercise your self in the Law of God? Is this your way to have a *Conscience* always *void of offence* towards God and towards man?

* In dubiis
pars tutior
est eligenda.
Tene veritas
& dimitte
inducuntur.

When you refuse obedience to the commands of your *Superiours*, you had need be very well assured of your warrant for it: The *Casuists* tell you, your grounds must be as clear as those upon which you are required to take a *solemn Oath*; for you do as much engage your Soul in one case as in the other, in both you pledge your interest in Gods favour, and venture your Salvation *. And it is observable, that God hath been more *severe* * in his inflictions toward such as have *despised* the commands of their *Governours*, than towards such as have disobeyed his own voice.

* See Rom
13.2.
Mat. 18. 17.
* See Men-
doza in 1.
Reg. 4. 3. 10.
Sall. 2.
Tom. 2. p. mi-
hi. 63.

But after all his pretensions to obey God, this *Replieant* doth prevaricate the very *principle* he so much insists upon; for he that prefers a *humane judgment* before Gods *express Command*, doth not obey God rather than man; and thus doth he: For it is Gods express command (in general) *That we should obey them that have the Rule over us*; but that we should not obey them (in this instance) *in the use of a prescribed Liturgy*,] is but a *humane judgment*; and yet he prefers and follows *this judgment* before *that Commandement*.

And now Sir, to return you your own words to the Doctor, *your holding your Conclusion is not in my power to hinder; but if your premisses be not push'd down, let all men of Reason judge.*]

In your close, you accost the Doctor in these words

[You

[*You have Sir been at the pains to transcribe Mr. Crofton's Creed in point of Church-Communion; præterea nihil; you deny no one Article, nor Dispute not against them (if that be good English,) herein them (you say) we are agreed; only Sir, let me tell you, that freedom from corruptions and disorders must be secured to the Church by the wayes God hath directed, not by words which men have dictated, and by their unwarranted power determined.*] To this I answer in short, That the Governours of this Church have exercised no power but what God hath warranted, nor walked in any wayes but such as God hath directed, to secure our freedom from Corruptions and Disorders; And that it is your duty to submit to that Power, and follow those wayes, hath been sufficiently evidenced against you.

For Mr. Crofton's CREED, the Doctor had no other design upon it than to give the people notice of his judgement, viz. That it is *their* duty to frequent the service of God administred by the *publick Liturgy*. But that it should be *sin* in *them* to *absent* themselves from *such a Worship* as Mr. Crofton and his Party cannot without *sin* administer unto them is a pretty Paradox, a device to teach men how they may *neither go to Church nor be at home*; frequenting that Service in *Hypocrisie*, which, according to your Doctrine, they cannot in *Sincerity* say Amen to.

I shall conclude mine own and the Readers trouble, in this Argument, as that Reverend Professor (whom you had in great admiration till he came to wear a *Rosbe*) concludes his Lecture, *De Autoritate Ecclesie in rebus Fidei; Disciplina optimè secundum Dei præscriptum observatur, quando Publica privato non permittantur arbitrio, sed An-*

Dr. T. H. B.
Lect. 22.
fol. p. 362.

istites præcipiunt, recipiunt subditi, non hi, pro illimitato imperio, illi pro occæcato obsequio, sed tam hi, quam illi juxta præscriptum, a summo Agonotheta in Scripturis, Canonem; ut ergo is incumbit, ut sine studio partium, bo-

na fide *deliberent* priusquam aliquid decernunt: Ita illis *permiffum* est, ut Expendant ad indubitatam *amiffim*, quid *injungitur*, ut agnoscant se didicisse a *Pastoribus* quod antea *ignorabant*. Tale autem *modestum* in domino *Examen*, *privatum* non sapit *spiritum*, quo turgent quos averfamur; Sed *solicitam* spirituum *probationem*, an sunt a *Deo*: *spiritus* siquidem habeatur *privatus*, vel respectu *persona*, quæ legitimè *querit*; vel *finis*, ut sibi *satis* *faciat*, vel *modi*, cum peculiarem sibi *eligit* *querendi* aut *iudicandi* *normam*, aut *formam*, Neglectis istis quæ a *supremo* *Legislatore* præscribuntur. Respectu *persona* aut *finis*, tantum abest, ut *obstemus* *privatorum* *industria*, ut invitamus illos potius, ad *Expendendam* *doctrinam* *nostram* ad *Sanctuarii* *stateram*, ut sibi ipsis *satisfaciant* & *fidem* *nostram* *liberent*; Qui vero secundum *hanc* *incedunt* *Regulam*, *pax* sit super eos, & *Israel* *Dei*, *furiosi* *verò* & *falsi*, qui privato elati aut inflati *lamine* aut *acuminè*, *Ecclesiam* cui *subijciuntur* *audire* *neglexerunt*; sine cuius *fideli* & *Orthodoxo* sicut *Ethnicus* & *Publicanus*, donec ex *debita* *correctione* aut *correctione* ad *sobrietatem* *discant* *sapere*, & ad *matris* *gremium* *redire*. Quod efficiat *pastor* *ille* *bonus*, qui *ovem* *Errantem* *propriis* *repperat* *humeris*. Cui cum *Patre* & *Spiritu* *Sancto* sit *omnis* *honor*, *laus*, & *gloria*, in *secula* *seculorum*, Amen.

Which may be thus rendred into English, For truly Discipline is best observed according to the Law and Ordinance of God, when Affairs that concern the publick are not left to the Award and Determination of private persons; but Governours command and Subjects obey, not the former by an Unlimited and Absolute Dominion, nor the latter by an Implicit and blind Obedience, but when Governours command and Subjects yield obedience according to the Rules mentioned in the Holy Scripture by the Supreme disposer and Lawgiver: As there-

therefore it is the duty of those in Authority, without partiality or *inclining* to any side with *Equity* and *Integrity* to deliberate, before they *resolve* or *determine* any thing: So, they that are to obey are allowed to examine and try by the *Undeniable* and *Undoubted Rule*, what is so enjoined them, that they may *confess* and *ingeniously acknowledge* that they have been brought by the *Care* of their Governours to understand their duty, which *before* they were utterly *Ignorant* of; And such kind of *modest* search or trial by the *Revealed Will* of God favours not of a *private spirit*, with which they are *puffed up*, whom we impugn; but is rather a diligent trying of the spirits, whether they be of God or no: For as much as a Spirit may be accounted private, either in regard of the *person* that seeketh, or in respect of the End and Drift of seeking, which is to *satisfie* himself; or in reference to the manner of seeking, when one goeth a *new way* to work to enform his judgment, chusing to himself a *peculiar* and *singular Rule* and *Square* to seek and judge by, *omitting* those Rules which for that very purpose have their Appointment from God *Almighty*. [In respect of the *Person* or *End*, we are so far from *hindring* the *Industry* of private persons, that we rather bid and *invite* them to *weigh* our Doctrine in the Ballance of the *Sanctuary*, that they may thereby *satisfie* themselves, and *acquit* our *fidelity*. And as many as walk according to this Rule, *Peace* be on them, and on the *Israel* of God; but they are *Furious* and *Factions*, as far from *Reason* as *Religion*, who being lifted up with the *Opinion* of their own *Judgment* and *Wisdom*, *neglect* to hear the Church to which they owe *Submission* and *Obedience*: Let such stubborn Children to every sound Believer be as a *Heathen* and a *Publican*, till upon due reproof and *correction* they learn to be wise unto Sobriety.

briety, and to return to the bosom of their *tender Mother*, which that *good Shepherd* grant who bringeth home the *straying Sheep* upon his own *shoulders*, To whom with the *Father*, and *blessed Spirit*, be all *Honour, Praise, and Glory*, for Ever and Ever, *Amen*.

Doctor

Doctor Edward Reynolds (now Lord Bishop of
Norwich) in a Sermon Preached at the Second
Triennial Visitation of the Right Reverend Father
in God Francis Lord Bishop of Peterborough,
at Daventry in Northampton-shire, July 12.
1637.

WHosoever by Pride, or Faction, or Schism, ^{a Pag. 13.}
or Ambition, or Novel Fancies, or Arro-
gance, or Ignorance, or Sedition, or Popu-
larity, or Vain-Glory, or Envy, or Discontent, or Cor-
respondence, or any other Carnal reason, shall rend the
Seamless Coat of Christ, and *cause Divisions and Offences*,
I shall need load him with no other guilt than the Apo-
stle doth, *That he is not the Servant of Christ*, Rom. 16. 17.
For how can he who is without Peace or Love, serve that
God who is the God of Peace, whose Name is Love, and
whose Law is Love?

^{b Pag. 19.}
b Greatly therefore doth it concern all of us in our
Places and Orders to put to all our Power, Prayers, Inte-
rests, for preserving the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of
Peace, and for pursuing and promoting the Peace of Je-
rusalem, that in nothing we give offence to the Church
of God; rather be willing to silence and smother our
private judgments, to relinquish our particular Liberties ^{δικαιο}
and Interests, to question and mistrust *domestica judicia* (as ^{λογισμοί,}
Tertullian calls them) our singular Conceits and Fancies, ^{as (b) just.}
^{in Gen.}
than ^{Hem. 4.}

than to be in any such thing stiff and Peremptory against the quiet of Gods Church.

c P. 32, 34.

[*As conducing herunto, he adviseth*] c Submission to the Spirits of the Prophets, and the judgments of the Godly learned; not to be stiff and inflexible in our own Conceits, nor to be Acceptors of our own persons, but to be willing to retract any Error, and with meekness and thankfulness to be led into the right way by any hand. Excellent was the resolution of *Job* in this case, *Teach me and I will hold my peace, and cause me to know wherein I have erred*, *Job* 6. 24. In which one disposition did all men, who otherwise differ, firmly agree, and were not too partially addicted to their own Fancies, nor had their judgments (which should be guided only by the truth of things) too much enthrall'd to their own Wills, Ends, or Passions; soon might they be brought, if not wherein they err, to change their judgments, yet at least so to allay them with Humility and Love (as *St. Cyprian* did his) that they should never break forth into bitterness towards their Brethren, or disturbance of the Church of God.

d Pag. 31.

In all differences 'tis recommended as a most Compendious Remedy to observe] d the Custom of the Churches of God. To retain that (when there is no express and evident variation from Divine Authority) which is most consonant to the received usage of the Ancient and pure Ages of the Church. This Rule the Apostle gives for suppressing of differences, *If any seem to be Contentious, we have no such Custom, neither the Churches of God*, *1 Cor.* 11. 16. *Inquire of the former Age saith Bildad, and prepare thy self to the search of their Fathers*, *Job* 8. 8. *Look to the old way saith the Prophet*, *Jer.* 6. 16. *It was not so from the beginning saith our Saviour*, *Mat.* 19. 8. Onely this Rule is to be qualified with this necessary distinction, That no Antiquity hath any Authority in Matters necessary, of Faith,

Faith, Worship, or Doctrines of Religion, to prescribe or deliver any thing, as *in it self*, and *immediately* obligatory to the Conscience, which is either *Contradicted* or *omitted* * in the written Word, which we believe to be fully sufficient to make the man of God perfect, and throughly furnished unto every good Work, 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17.

* For Satisfaction herein. Consult Doctor H. Hammond's Letter of Resolution. *Quare* 1. Of Resolving Controversies, per totum.

But, 1. In Matters *accessory* of *indifferency*, order, decency, and *inferiour Nature*. 2. In Matter of *Testimony* to the Truths of Scripture, and for manifesting the Succession, Flourishing, and Harmony of Doctrines through all Ages of the Church, the Godly learned have justly ascribed much to the Authority and usage of the Ancient Churches. The study of the Doctrine and Rites whereof is justly called by the most Learned Primate of Ireland, *A noble Study*. I will conclude this particular with the words of St. *Augustine*, In those things, saith he, wherein the Holy Scripture hath defined nothing, *Mos Populi Dei & instituta Majorum pro lege tenenda sunt*, the Custom of Gods people and appointments of our Fore-Fathers must be held for Laws.

Discipline and Fatherly Government (is requisite) to keep the Stones of the Building in Order, and to reduce all unto Decency and Beauty: for as God must be served with *Holiness*, so it must be in the *Beauty of Holiness* too, and Unity is the Beauty of the Church. *Behold how pleasant it is for Brethren to dwell together in Unity.*

And here let me speak one word to you who are Church-Wardens, and are entrusted with the care of Presenting Disorders to the Governours of the Church; to beseech you to consider the Religion and Sacredness of an Oath, which in the House of God, and as you expect help from God, you promise to perform; with the Reverence of which Oath and Fear of Gods dreadful Name,

H

were

were you so thoroughly affected, as indeed you ought, we should not see what with grief we do, so great Contempt of Gods House and Ordinances, as if they were common and prophane things; many scarce throughout the whole year making their Confession of sins to God in the Assembly of his People, many seldom or never hearing one Psalm of *David*, or Chapter of the Holy Scriptures read unto them; nay, many neglecting the whole Liturgy of the Church, and dropping in after the Sermon is begun, and though the Preacher hath taken sad pains for what in the Name of God he speaks unto them, having not yet the patience to stay till that piece of the hour be ended. Certainly *David* had learned more Reverence to the Lords House, *I was glad when they said, Let us go into the House of the Lord*, Psal. 122. 1. and so had *Cornelius*, who with his Kindred and near Friends waited for the coming of *Peter*, *Acts* 10. 24. and so had *Solomon*, who teacheth men to watch daily at the Gates, and to give attendance at the Posts of the Doors of Gods House, *Prov.* 8. 34. And the Prophecies foretell the like of Gods people under the Gospel, that they should call upon one another, and should go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord, *Zach.* 8. 21. I speak this in Zele to the Service of God, and to the Reverence of his Sanctuary, and beseech you by the Sacredness of your Oath, and for the fear of Gods Name to think upon it. Thus far the Pious, Learned, and Reverend Dr. *Reynolds* (now Lord Bishop of *Notwich*) in that his Sermon at the Visitation.

F I N I S.

